REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In accordance with Applicant's Interview with the Examiner on December 3, 2008, this Response is Supplemental to the Response filed on November 6, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments and remarks submitted in the Response filed on November 6, 2008, NOT be entered into the present application, and that the amendments and remarks presented herein be entered instead.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and remarks in the July 29, 2008 Office Action and November 17, 2008 Advisory Action, and in the interest of expediting prosecution, this Supplemental Response includes numerous additional clarifying amendments to the claims in addition to or in place of those presented in the November 6, 2008 Response. These additional clarifying amendments are presented to attempt to further advance prosecution of the application and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments presented herein and consideration of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 6-15, 17-23, 25, and 27 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 15, and 23 being independent. Claims 2, 5, 16, and 24 were previously canceled, and Claims 4 and 26 are canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 8-15, and 23 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. Specifically, Support for the amendments to Claim 1 and 23 is present at least on Page 46, Lines 3-20, Figure 13, Page 49, Lines 5-13, and Figure 14. Support for the amendments to Claim 15 is present at least on Page 33, Lines 23-25, Page 34, Lines 1-10, and Figure 10. No new matter has been added.

<u>STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW</u>

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Yigdall for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative, Elliott Y. Chen, on December 3, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed the rejection of Claims 1 in view of U.S. Publication 2004/0153995 to Polonovski (hereinafter "Polonovski") and U.S. Publication 2004/0006765 to Goldman (hereinafter "Goldman). No agreement was reached regarding the allowability of Claim 1. The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for the Interview.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended Claim 23 to recite statutory subject matter. More specifically, Applicant has amended claim 23 to recite system components that are within statutory subject matter rather than purely functional ("means") recitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Polonovski in view of Goldman. Claims 4 and 26 are newly canceled. Respectfully, Applicant submits that the remaining claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

<u>Claims 1, 3 and 6-14</u>

Independent Claim 1, as presently presented, recites:

> 1. A computer readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions, the instructions comprising:
>> receiving a string in an interactive environment, the string including a plurality of pipelined cmdlets;
>> identifying an attribution for each of the plurality of pipelined cmdlets within the string, each attribution to specify a constraint for an associated construct;
>> identifying the associated construct of each attribution in the string;
>> saving information that correlates each constraint with its associated construct as metadata that is associated with each construct; and
>> executing the string in the interactive environment, wherein executing the string includes:
>>> executing a first cmdlet of the plurality of pipelined cmdlets by using metadata associated with a first construct to apply a first constraint to the first construct *to produce output objects*;
>>> *providing the output objects to a second cmdlet* of the plurality of *pipelined* cmdlets *as input for a second construct*; and
>>> *executing the second cmdlet by using metadata associated with the second construct to apply a second constraint to the second construct.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, Polonovski does not teach or suggest the above emphasized elements of Claim 1. As noted in the Office Action, Polonovski does not disclose executing the string in an interactive environment. (Office Action dated July 29, 2008, Page 5, Paragraph 3, Lines 1-5). Therefore, Polonovski cannot teach the above emphasized elements of Claim 1.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Polonovski with respect to these elements are not remedied by Goldman. Goldman discloses a visual programming environment in which "aspects of a program's behavior can be modified while the program runs, without the

write-compile-execute cycle that routinely bogs down software development." (Goldman, Paragraph 17, Lines 4-8).

However, Goldman is silent with respect to the "cmdlets" recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Goldman is also silent with respect to *providing the output objects to a second cmdlet* of the plurality of *pipelined* cmdlets *as input for a second construct*," as recited in Claim 1, where the "output objects" are produced by executing "the first cmdlet of the plurality of the *pipelined* cmdlets."

Indeed, Goldman does not disclose "pipelined cmdlets", and the use of an output from a first cmdlet of the "pipelined cmdlets" as input to a second cmdlet of the "pipelined cmdlets", so that metadata may be applied during the executing of the second of the "pipelined cmdlets."

Thus, the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, discloses, or fairly suggest every element of Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Due to the Applicant's earnest belief that the Claim 1, as rejected under Section 103(a), is allowable because its recited elements are not taught or suggested in the cited references, Applicant will not address motivation to combine with respect to Claim 1 during this response. However, Applicant hereby reserves the right to further challenge motivation to combine the cited references.

Dependent Claims 3 and 6-14 depend from independent Claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

<u>Claims 15 and 17-22</u>

Independent Claim 15, as presently presented, recites:

> 15.   A method for handling constraints specified within an interactive environment, the method comprising:
> identifying a pre-defined begin symbol and end symbol within a script entered in an interactive environment;
> identifying a constraint between the begin symbol and the end symbol;
> identifying a construct following the end symbol;
> saving information that correlates the constraint with the construct as metadata that is associated with the construct; and
> executing the string in the interactive environment, wherein executing the string includes:
> using the saved information to apply the constraint to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution; and
> processing one or more built-in capabilities that include control structures via cmdlets.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, as noted in the Office Action, Polonovski does not disclose executing the string in an interactive environment. (Office Action dated July 29, 2008, Page 5, Paragraph 3, Lines 1-5). Accordingly, Polonovski cannot teach or suggest, "executing the string in the interactive environment, wherein executing the string includes: *processing one or more built-in capabilities that include control structures via cmdlets*," as recited in Claim 15. (Emphasis added).

Moreover, the deficiencies of Polonovski with respect to these elements are not remedied by Goldman. Goldman discloses a visual programming environment in which "aspects of a program's behavior can be modified while the program runs, without the write-compile-execute cycle that routinely bogs down software development." (Goldman, Paragraph 17, Lines 4-8).

However, Goldman is silent with respect to the "cmdlets" recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Goldman also cannot teach or suggest, "executing the string in the

interactive environment, wherein executing the string includes: *processing one or more built-in capabilities that include control structures via cmdlets,*" as recited in Claim 15. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 15 is believed to be allowable. (Emphasis added).

Due to the Applicant's earnest belief that the Claim 15, as rejected under Section 103(a), is allowable because its recited elements are not taught or suggested in the cited references, Applicant will not address motivation to combine with respect to Claim 15 during this response. However, Applicant hereby reserves the right to further challenge motivation to combine the cited references.

Dependent Claims 17-22 depend from independent Claim 15 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Claims 23, 25, and 27

Independent Claim 23, as presently presented, recites:

> 23. A system that handles input parameters, the system comprising:
>   one or more processors; and
>   memory to store a plurality of computer-executable instructions for execution by the one or more processors, the computer-executable instructions, when executed, operable to:
>   receive a string into a command line interactive environment, the string including a plurality of pipelined cmdlets;
>   identify an attribution for each of the plurality of pipelined cmdlets within the string, each attribution to specify a constraint for an associated construct;
>   identify the associated construct of each attribution in the string;

save information that correlates each constraint with its associated construct as metadata that is associated with each construct; and

execute the string in the interactive environment, wherein the execution includes:

executing a first cmdlet of the plurality of pipelined cmdlets by using metadata associated with a first construct to apply a first constraint to the first construct *to produce output objects*;

providing the output objects to a second cmdlet of the plurality of *pipelined* cmdlets *as input for a second construct*; and

executing the second cmdlet by using metadata associated with the second construct to apply a second constraint to the second construct.
(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, discloses, or fairly suggest the above emphasized elements of Claim 23. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 23 is believed to be allowable.

Due to the Applicant's earnest belief that the Claim 23, as rejected under Section 103(a), is allowable because its recited elements are not taught or suggested in the cited references, Applicant will not address motivation to combine with respect to Claim 23 during this response. However, Applicant hereby reserves the right to further challenge motivation to combine the cited references.

Dependent Claims 25 and 27 depend from independent Claim 23 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claims 1, 3, 6-15, 17-23, 25 and 27 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: _1-28-09_   By: _____

Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58293
206-315-7914